

1 PROPOSED CHANGES
2 ON THE
3 HANFORD PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN
4

5
6
7 PUBLIC MEETING
8 TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2011
9

10
11 Seattle Center
12 Northwest Building, Olympic Room
13 305 Harrison Street
14 Seattle, Washington

15 PRESENTATION SPEAKERS:

16 JUDY SMITH, Facilitator

17 DIETER BOHRMANN, Washington State Department of Ecology

18 PAULA CALL, U.S. Department of Energy

19 EMERALD LAIJA, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
20
21
22
23
24

25 Reported by: Dianne Wilson, CCR-RPR
License No. 600 510 042

1 JUDY SMITH: Good evening. My name is Judy Smith,
2 and I am a part of the Environmental Protection Agency's
3 Facilitator Network. And in my real job I'm a community
4 involvement coordinator. I work in Portland, Oregon, and I
5 work mostly on the Portland Harbor Superfund site, and I've
6 been working lately on some projects up in Alaska. And I'm
7 here to work with the Tri-Party agencies this evening to
8 just help with the public meeting.

9 And my role as facilitator this evening is to keep the
10 meeting on time and on track. And so what I'll be doing is
11 kind of time checks for the presenters and just make sure
12 that we're doing what we came here to do.

13 And so it's going to be a meeting in three parts. And
14 the first part is that we're going to have a very brief
15 presentation from a couple of the Tri-Party agency folks,
16 just kind of an overview of the Public Involvement Plan
17 changes that we're here to see.

18 And then the second part of the meeting we'll have -- I
19 guess the agenda is up here -- but we'll have a clarifying
20 question and answer session. And I guess the overview will
21 include a local perspective. And then what we're really
22 here mostly for is to listen to you and to hear about what
23 your thoughts were on the proposed changes to the Public
24 Involvement Plan.

25 And I'd like to thank everybody for coming out, because

1 there are a lot of issues. And I know that everybody is
2 here this evening because this project and the subject is
3 important to you or else you probably wouldn't have made the
4 time to come here. And so we appreciate that, that you are
5 willing to do that.

6 And I have a couple of guidelines that I'd like to offer
7 up, to have the meeting be really successful and productive
8 for us tonight. And the first one is, if you have a cell
9 phone with you, if you could either turn it off or put it on
10 stun, that will just help that from unexpected
11 interruptions.

12 The second thing that I would ask is that we only have
13 one person talking at a time and that if there's side
14 conversations, so people around can hear, if you must talk
15 to somebody during the meeting if you could move outside the
16 room, that would be better.

17 And the third one is to respect any differing opinions
18 that are offered up. And I know sometimes people will have
19 different opinions on things. And I think it's important to
20 respect the different points of view, even if you don't
21 agree with them.

22 And with that said, since you are here and you may feel
23 strongly about something, I want this to be a really safe
24 place for you to express those views. And so if you feel
25 strongly about an issue or if you feel strongly about them,

1 I think it's okay to say that. But if it becomes personal
2 and it becomes a strong opinion or a strong attack on
3 another individual, as facilitator I'll probably -- I'll
4 step in and I'll ask you to stick to the issues, because I
5 want everybody to feel very safe to say what's really
6 important to you and in the long term to help us with the
7 Hanford site there.

8 And with that said, I think I'll go ahead and turn the
9 floor over to Dieter, who will be making our first
10 presentation.

11 DIETER BOHRMANN: Hi. My name is Dieter Bohrmann.
12 I'm with the Washington Department of Ecology. And we are
13 based in Richland, our office. I'm the public involvement
14 lead for the Richland office, which is our Hanford field
15 office. There are four of us in the office whose primary
16 job is education outreach for Hanford and public
17 involvement.

18 So I just want to talk a little bit about what we're
19 doing in our office. We have made education outreach to
20 students a particular focus over the last couple of years.
21 This year alone we have probably spoken to about a thousand
22 students across the Northwest. We have talked to, of
23 course, many schools in the Tri-City area, where we're
24 based, and we've also been over to the University of
25 Washington and Portland State University to talk to students

1 there. So we're trying to -- We realize that Hanford is a
2 regional and national issue, so we do try to get out around
3 the state and around the Northwest, to hit up a lot of
4 different schools, talk to a lot of different students about
5 what's going on at the site and about what the State is
6 doing to help with the cleanup.

7 We're also out at community events, the fair and some
8 other expos around the Tri-Cities, where we talk to several
9 hundred more people, with the informational materials that
10 we have. And it's a good way to engage with the public
11 about, again, what we're doing.

12 We speak -- also speak to the media 40 or 50 times a
13 year. There are a lot of stories of interest that make the
14 news. And we want to be out in front of that with our
15 position and the State's views as well.

16 And we're also tracking all of our public involvement
17 and outreach events in an internal database that we have.

18 We set goals for ourselves at the beginning of the year:
19 These are things we want to accomplish. These are the
20 number of people we want to speak with. So we can gauge
21 against that how are we doing, what do we want to do more
22 of, what works, what doesn't work. So we do set a lot of
23 goals for ourselves. We are very committed to public
24 involvement, trying new techniques, trying new outreach to
25 get more people involved.

1 And one of the tools that we use is a listserv that --
2 an e-mail listserv. It currently has about 750 subscribers
3 on it. And you can subscribe through the Department of
4 Ecology's website.

5 I realize many of you are probably on multiple
6 listservs. Some of you may be on the Tri-Party Agreement
7 listserv that Ecology maintains. I brought some sign-up
8 sheets tonight. So if you are not and you would like to
9 sign up for that as well, it is one communication tool that
10 the Tri-Parties use to talk about public involvement events,
11 opportunities out at the Hanford site, get information about
12 upcoming comment periods or other decisions that are being
13 made. So it's a good way to stay in the loop about Hanford.
14 And I say one of the tools because we also use various
15 social media and other outreach techniques to talk about
16 cleanup.

17 So again, I do have some sign-up sheets here. So feel
18 free to -- Maybe after the meeting we can pass that around.

19 And finally, I know that many of you have heard about
20 the proposed reductions to the public participation grants
21 that the State of Washington Department of Ecology
22 administers. And we wanted to echo our disappointment that
23 this proposed reduction was made. It is one of many very
24 difficult decisions for cuts that are on the table for the
25 state as we try to close a \$2 billion budget gap. This is

1 not an attack on public participation. We realize the value
2 that interest groups bring to Hanford and the good work that
3 they do in helping to educate the public.

4 And not just -- not just Hanford. This is a statewide
5 grant program. So there's about 40 groups across the state
6 in various projects that are helping with public involvement
7 and helping educate people on different issues. So if there
8 are questions about that tonight, I'm happy to take those.

9 Again, one of many different cuts that are on the table.
10 So we hope that those cuts aren't accepted. We have
11 committed to reimbursing groups through November 4th for
12 expenses already paid from the start of the biennium, which
13 started July 1st. So after that, we just don't know what's
14 going to happen. But we're keeping our fingers crossed that
15 that money stays in there and continues to fund this good
16 work.

17 So thanks, good to be here, and thank you all for
18 coming.

19 JUDY SMITH: Next we'll get an introduction from
20 Paula Call from Department of Energy.

21 PAULA CALL: Hi. I'm Paula Call with the
22 Department of Energy. And I'll keep my remarks very brief
23 because I know we want to get to the presentation.

24 I just want to say thank you, thank you very much for
25 coming tonight. It's great to see you. I'm really looking

1 forward, as are Emy and Dieter, to hear what you have to say
2 about the revised or proposed revisions to the Public
3 Involvement Plan.

4 We started -- Our first meeting on this plan was last
5 week. Were any of you on the webinar that we held? Oh, a
6 few of you were. Great. Our very first attempt at the
7 Tri-Party agencies to venture out into using the technology
8 that we have available to us now.

9 I just wanted to say that there were about 20
10 participants, active participants, on the webinar. And
11 several of them encouraged us to "Don't be discouraged
12 because of the low turnout. Keep trying new things. And it
13 is a convenient way to get involved and participate during
14 the public comment period." So we'll keep trying things
15 like that. But it is not a substitute for a face-to-face
16 public meeting. So when called for, we will be coming out
17 around the region to have face-to-face public meetings like
18 we are tonight.

19 So I'll turn it over to Emy.

20 EMERALD LAIJA: We have a little traffic up front.
21 Sorry.

22 Hi, everyone. My name is Emy Laija. I work for the
23 Environmental Protection Agency.

24 Again, as everyone has already said, thank you so much
25 for coming out. I realize this isn't exactly a cleanup

1 decision, so it doesn't have a lot of the drama and
2 excitement that cleanup decisions usually have. But it's
3 still a really important topic for us to talk about, public
4 participation and the public participation plan.

5 Next slide, please.

6 So I'll start off just with some background information
7 on the plan itself and then the key changes that we have
8 made. And then I'll talk about how you can provide your
9 input on these proposed changes at the end of the
10 presentation.

11 So one question you may have had is, what is the Hanford
12 Public Involvement Plan? Well, the Hanford Public
13 Involvement Plan identifies ways that the public can
14 participate in the decision-making process at the Hanford
15 site. It serves as the overall guidance document for how
16 people can become active in these decisions and also on our
17 outreach activities at Hanford.

18 When I first started working for EPA a couple years ago,
19 my boss handed me the Public Involvement Plan and said,
20 "Here. Read this. You are going to need to know what this
21 says for the parts of your job that pertain to public
22 involvement."

23 I was brand-new to EPA, so I said, "Sure. Okay. I'll
24 read it." And so I read through it. And with Hanford being
25 so large and so complex, it actually was a really good

1 starter document to give me some history on the site and to
2 let me know where the public comes into that whole dynamic
3 on how we make a cleanup decision at Hanford. For me it was
4 a good starting document just to get oriented with Hanford.

5 Another question you might have had is, why should I
6 care about providing input on this document? Well, this is
7 your opportunity to provide input on the document that
8 guides public participation at the Hanford site. We want to
9 hear what you have to say and hear what your concerns are so
10 that we can have a good document that will be good not only
11 for the agency staff that will read it the way I did when I
12 started working on Hanford but also for general people, the
13 public, who might want to know how they can become more
14 active at the Hanford site.

15 All the comments that are received will be considered
16 before we finalize the changes to the document. And I'll
17 talk a little bit more about that at the end of the
18 presentation.

19 Next slide.

20 So who is proposing changes to the plan? That would be
21 the Tri-Party Agreement agencies -- you have heard from each
22 of us tonight -- DOE, EPA, and Ecology.

23 We entered into the Tri-Party Agreement in 1989. So
24 it's been awhile since we first signed that document. It's
25 a legally binding document, which includes a completion

1 schedule for Hanford cleanup. And it also requires that we
2 have a public involvement plan for the Hanford site. That
3 requirement actually comes from a federal regulation known
4 as CERCLA, the Comprehensive Environmental Response
5 Liability --

6 JUDY SMITH: Compensation and Liability Act.

7 EMERALD LAIJA: I knew I was going to mess up on
8 the acronyms. I apologize. I'm a little nervous.

9 But anyways, so we entered into the agreement in 1989,
10 and we had this requirement to have this document. So it
11 was first issued in 1990. This is actually the fifth
12 revision of the document, the last one occurring in 2002.
13 As you can imagine, since 1990 material becomes dated. So
14 we have to update the document so that it's current and can
15 be used by anybody who is interested in public participation
16 at the Hanford site.

17 During this time --

18 Or I should say we have been talking about updating this
19 plan for over a year. It's been a long discussion and quite
20 a bit of a process to get to the public comment period we're
21 at right now.

22 So during this time we did receive input on suggested
23 changes to the plan from the Hanford Advisory Board. That's
24 our citizens advisory board that provides advice to the
25 Tri-Party agencies on Hanford issues. So we have had some

1 input during this process on some suggested changes. And a
2 lot of those suggestions are reflected in the version of the
3 document that's out for public comment right now.

4 Next slide.

5 So what were the key changes to the document? The first
6 one is the title. The original title was quite long. It
7 was the Hanford Site Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement
8 Community Relations Plan. So that's a bit long and drawn
9 out. We would like to simplify it to just be the Hanford
10 Public Involvement Plan. That's the most obvious change.

11 Other changes include an addition of a "Public
12 Involvement" section. And this talks about public
13 involvement goals. Some of that material was in the 2002
14 version, but in the changes we're proposing we actually
15 identify a separate section and talk about those goals
16 individually.

17 And we have also updated our public involvement
18 evaluation process.

19 As I mentioned, over time, material can become outdated,
20 so we have streamlined some of the information. And please
21 don't take that to mean that we just deleted old sections.
22 Really, streamlining means anything that's outdated we have
23 removed and replaced with current information.

24 For example, some terms used a lot on Hanford cleanup
25 are "the River Corridor" or "the Central Plateau." The 2002

1 version did not have these terms anywhere in there because
2 they just really started being used recently. So we have
3 updated the history of Hanford to include those terms so it
4 relates to the terms we use in public meetings and in other
5 dialogues.

6 We have also added links and photos particularly for
7 people who want to know where they can find more
8 information. We've tried to provide them with as many
9 sources that they can go to as possible so if they want to
10 find that information they know where to go.

11 Next slide.

12 This slide here really is a table of contents of the
13 document. I believe Section 1 is probably of most interest
14 to people, the public. That talks about public involvement
15 goals, the importance of public involvement, and some of the
16 opportunities that you will have to be involved at the
17 Hanford site.

18 Another section that people may be interested in is
19 Section 3. That talks about information resources. If you
20 want to find out more about Hanford, we talk about our
21 online calendar, our listserv, how you can join that, and
22 how you can access documents that you may want to read
23 regarding Hanford decisions.

24 And Section 5, which is -- if you are brand-new to
25 Hanford is also helpful. It's just the background

1 information on the site. It's very clear and concise, just
2 gives you an idea of the history, because it is so long and
3 can be complex. And it talks a little bit about current
4 operations as well.

5 So this version is a bit different from the 2002 layout.
6 We did try to make it -- give it a more logical flow and
7 streamline the document so it's easier to read.

8 Next slide.

9 So where do we go from here? What happens next? We're
10 in our public comment period right now. We were going to
11 end our public comment period on November 28th. On our
12 webinar we received a request to extend that, so we have
13 extended the public comment period to December 15th. So
14 there's more time to provide your input.

15 We had our webinar last week, we have a meeting here
16 tonight, and then we'll have a meeting in Spokane tomorrow.
17 And we'll be collecting comments at all of these events.

18 I had mentioned that all of the comments that are going
19 to be taken will be considered before we finalize the
20 document. What that means is we'll compile them, review
21 them, and see what changes we can incorporate into the final
22 version of the document.

23 A comment and response document is going to be issued.
24 And really if you want to know what happened to your
25 comment, how it was viewed, whether or not it was

1 implemented, the comment and response document will be where
2 that answer is. We'll talk about, "Oh, yes, we agreed with
3 this comment, and we have made this change to the document."
4 Or we might say, "We don't agree with this comment for these
5 reasons. Therefore a change was not made." It will give
6 you an idea of what we did with your comment. So you will
7 understand why the final version of the document is what it
8 turns out to be.

9 Next slide.

10 So again, we are in our public comment period until
11 December 15th. You can provide verbal comments here at this
12 public meeting. If you are not comfortable with speaking in
13 a group setting, you can also provide us written comments on
14 the back of your agenda. There is a space where you can
15 write down your comment and give it either at that table
16 where you signed in or any of the agency representatives
17 will be happy to take it. Or you can write your comment at
18 home and mail it in. Or a lot of people use e-mail now. If
19 that's more convenient, you can e-mail us your comment as
20 well. So you have all of these avenues to provide us your
21 input. And as I said, all these comments will be considered
22 as we're finalizing the document.

23 Next slide, please.

24 And just to give you a heads-up, the Hanford events
25 calendar is a calendar where we post all our public comment

1 periods. And if you click on a date within that period,
2 we'll provide you links to our facts sheet, video,
3 frequently asked questions. Any material or key documents
4 related to that decision we're trying to put on here. So I
5 would just -- If you haven't been to the hanford.gov
6 website, I wanted to do a little plug for it here to check
7 out the events calendar. We're really starting to rely on
8 that more to let people know this is what you can be
9 involved in and also to provide them with more information
10 if they want to get more educated on the subject.

11 And that is all I have.

12 JUDY SMITH: Thanks, Emy.

13 There's two things that I wanted to mention at this
14 point in time. One is that, you know, we like our public
15 meetings to be the best that they can be. And so there is a
16 public meeting evaluation form back on the registration
17 table. And so if you have any feedback for the project team
18 on this, please go ahead and fill it out and send it in at
19 the end of the meeting.

20 And the other thing is, a tool that we're using this
21 evening is that -- You know, as Emy said, there's a lot of
22 different ways that you can provide public comment. You can
23 write it and leave it here or e-mail it. And spoken public
24 comment is an important way to do it.

25 And in order to kind of keep things flowing, what we ask

1 people to do is kind of fill out information on kind of a
2 speaker card. And then what I'll do is I'll call people up
3 in the order that we got the cards back. I have the stack
4 that's been filled out so far. And then we hand them to the
5 court reporter, and that way she knows that they have your
6 name spelling correct, and you can also get then a copy of
7 the responsiveness document when it's ready. So there's a
8 lot of good reasons we use this.

9 And these are blank. So if anybody -- There's some more
10 on the back table too. So if you decide you want to speak
11 at the last minute, you are welcome to do that. You are not
12 going to lose the opportunity because you didn't fill this
13 out when you came in. So we want to make sure that, you
14 know, if you are motivated to speak and didn't think you
15 would, you're welcome to do that. But I do have the cards.

16 Does anybody have a card with them that they want to
17 bring up? You can either hand them to me or someone in the
18 back of the room, and we'll make sure that, you know, you
19 have your opportunity to talk.

20 At this time, I'd like to invite a local perspective
21 from a representative of Heart of America Northwest. And
22 I'm sorry, I don't have the name of the representative.

23 GERRY POLLET: This is Mark Loper, and I'm Gerry
24 Pollet with Heart of America Northwest. Thank you all for
25 coming this evening.

1 This is going to be a public interest group perspective
2 on the Public Involvement Plan including the results of a
3 major survey done by Heart of America Northwest with the
4 help of Seattle University students who do internships with
5 us this spring.

6 How many of you have been to public meetings on Hanford
7 cleanup before?

8 And some of you are brand-new to a Hanford public
9 meeting. Raise your hands. Thank you for coming. This is
10 fabulous.

11 Those of you who have come to public meetings before
12 raise your hands again, please.

13 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: Hanford public meetings?

14 GERRY POLLET: Hanford public meetings.

15 Now, keep your hand up if you believe that they may be
16 improved.

17 Okay. So we're here tonight to see what can be done to
18 improve Hanford public meetings and notices, what are your
19 ideas, and what ought to be in the Public Involvement Plan,
20 which for Superfund sites is supposed to be not only a guide
21 or a description but discuss your rights, for instance, to
22 public meetings at each phase of the Superfund process. And
23 for Hanford, half of it is also for hazardous waste
24 processes. Those include things that go boom, buildings
25 that store chemicals that are explosive, high-level nuclear

1 waste tanks that could fail in the event of an earthquake or
2 are leaking to the groundwater, and how do we clean up the
3 Superfund sites. Each step of the process there are
4 supposed to be specific rights that the public has that are
5 supposed to be described and expanded upon in the Public
6 Involvement Plan.

7 I'll turn it over to Mark.

8 MARK LOPER: I'm going to try to do this while
9 changing the slide.

10 GERRY POLLET: Well, I'll change the slides.

11 MARK LOPER: Okay. So we did the survey back in
12 March with our Seattle U students under the supervision of
13 Gerry here at the time. I wasn't there. But --

14 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: Can you talk into that thing
15 a little bit?

16 MARK LOPER: We surveyed 143 people, and 77 percent
17 of our respondents had gone to a public meeting, just to
18 give you a basic understanding of who we talked to. And you
19 can see that we used the agency listserv, which has 750,
20 like Dieter said. But we took out half of them because they
21 were contractors and other agency representatives. So
22 there's about 300 people who are members of the public that
23 received these messages from the TPA.

24 And we asked them, "What is the best way for you to
25 receive a notice?" And they said that e-mail was

1 overwhelmingly the best. But to be fair, we did conduct
2 some of these interviews through e-mail, so it's a little
3 biased.

4 But going to the next slide, we asked a question on
5 trust, ranking if you trusted the presenters on a scale of
6 one to five, one being the least amount of trust and five
7 being the highest amount of trust. And as you can see, we
8 have the highest amount of trust over here for the DOE, and
9 70 percent said that they lacked trust in the U.S. DOE and
10 only six percent had high or the highest amount of trust.

11 GERRY POLLET: Let's just stop for a second. So
12 this is asking people who have gone to the meetings, "Who do
13 you trust when you are getting the presentations?" So it
14 shows that there's a problem with the presentations being
15 made if 70 percent of the public does not trust the
16 presenters after they've been to more than one meeting.

17 MARK LOPER: And then going on, we can see that
18 only 22 percent placed the highest or a high amount of trust
19 in the EPA.

20 And then on the next slide, you will see that in
21 Washington officials -- so that would be Ecology -- we have
22 got a fairly low amount of trust in the agency as well.

23 And then this is the response for the trust in the
24 alternate perspective, or the citizens group. And it's
25 overwhelmingly positive for that category, 80 percent high

1 or highest amount of trust.

2 And then going into different public meeting
3 issues/concerns, we asked them "Was there enough time to
4 voice concerns? Was your voice heard? What was that? Did
5 you feel like you had an impact on the decision?"

6 And then we have separation information that we asked
7 that we're not going to talk about tonight regarding where
8 they prefer to hold meetings.

9 So "Was there enough time to voice concern?" Only 48
10 percent yes, which we believe is a failing grade, since
11 that's the main purpose of a public hearing or meeting, is
12 to get public comment and to listen to the public. And 48
13 percent doesn't seem like it's enough.

14 And 47 percent feel their comments had little or no
15 impact. So those who stood up and made public comment felt
16 like it was like on deaf ears. So that could definitely be
17 improved.

18 And "Do you remember receiving a written response to
19 your comments?" which is something that the agency strived
20 to do in the Public Involvement Plan. That's something that
21 they have written that they strive to do. And only 63
22 percent -- Well, actually, 63 percent said no, they don't
23 remember receiving comments. That's a huge portion of
24 people who made comments and are invested in this and don't
25 remember receiving an answer.

1 And then this is the percentage of those who prefer to
2 receive notices and like how they will open -- whether or
3 not they will open it. And on the right, the red is a
4 four-page citizens' guide from a citizens group. And then
5 the left, the blue, is an official U.S. DOE or Tri-Party
6 Agreement mailing. So 42 percent said they would be more
7 likely to -- they would be likely to open a citizens' guide,
8 and 18 percent said they would be likely to open the
9 Tri-Party agency e-mail.

10 So going on to our recommendations, the Tri-Party
11 agencies need to have a larger listserv. It's really clear
12 that we need to start working on outreach for that. And it
13 should have goals in the Public Involvement Plan. And I
14 think like what Dieter said tonight, having a sign-up list
15 at the event is a great start. But having that in the
16 Public Involvement Plan and having methods and strategies to
17 improve the listserv should be included.

18 And as Gerry was mentioning, the exact language from the
19 Superfund Community Involvement Handbook says that the
20 Community Involvement Plan -- which in this case would be
21 the Public Involvement Plan -- format should include a cover
22 page that identifies the CIP as an EPA document and also
23 include information specifying what EPA will do, not what
24 EPA should do or strive to do. "The Tri-Party agencies
25 strive to" is something that is repeatedly said in the plan.

1 And it's clearly in opposition to its own guidelines. And
2 the EPA should not sign on to the plan if it includes a
3 majority of public involvement language that does not
4 describe what the EPA and the Tri-Party agencies should do.

5 GERRY POLLET: Will do.

6 MARK LOPER: Will do.

7 The 1990 original Community Relations Plan called for
8 specific meetings in Spokane, Portland, Vancouver, Yakima,
9 Seattle, and the Tri-Cities. And over the years this
10 language has been stripped down into "key areas" or "key
11 significant areas" or "interested parties." And we think
12 that key cities should be labeled and named and they should
13 be guaranteed at least a meeting annually, like it was in
14 the original plan.

15 And then the changes to the public evaluation process.
16 The proposed changes limit surveys to only those who attend
17 meetings. The language went from a paragraph describing
18 exactly who was going to be asked what to a paragraph saying
19 "We'll do an annual evaluation." It used to say
20 something that was much more detailed, and now it's broad
21 and general and you can't tell who they're going to be
22 asking. But before, you could. So it cuts off what they
23 can do better by not expanding the universe of opinions.
24 And why was this changed? It seems like it's become more
25 general than a specific survey.

1 And access to information. The plan should guarantee
2 comments will be extended until all records are available.
3 The plan should ensure the administrative record will be
4 easily searchable for public information. And documents for
5 comment periods should be easily obtained from each agency's
6 website.

7 Responses to public comments. People will not attend
8 meetings if they repeatedly feel that they have little or no
9 impact, like I was saying earlier. The Public Involvement
10 Plan should require that there is a timely written response
11 not just strive to. And the agencies need to demonstrate
12 that they will be -- that they will incorporate the public's
13 views in their -- in their actual decisions. And it needs
14 to be much more clearly defined, I think.

15 And the proposed revision in the -- So the 2002 CRP said
16 that the Tri-Party agencies also conduct regularly scheduled
17 meetings with public interest group representatives to
18 discuss Hanford site issues and concerns. This language is
19 taken out of it for no apparent reason. And about three
20 years ago, these meetings that were called for in the Public
21 Involvement Plan stopped. And we would like to start those
22 again and have that language put back in the Public
23 Involvement Plan.

24 The reason for updating the plan is to better public
25 involvement, but there are actually no new requirements or

1 even new things the agencies are striving for to improve
2 public involvement. One thing that I noticed was that there
3 was a clear lack of involvement in the Tri-Cities. And
4 there's nothing in the Public Involvement Plan that mentions
5 this or says how they're going to try to improve public
6 involvement in like this certain area in a certain issue.
7 And other cities are striving to have meetings, like
8 Spokane, which we're actually having a meeting tomorrow.
9 It's the first one in two years. And they should be
10 guaranteed meetings if they're wanting a meeting. And we
11 think that the Public Involvement Plan is the venue for that
12 to be called for.

13 That is the last slide, yep.

14 GERRY POLLET: Let me go back to the slide with the
15 comparison of the citizen guides. Where is that slide?

16 MARK LOPER: I can't see that. I'll figure it out.

17 GERRY POLLET: Mark mentioned one of these
18 slides -- that we'll figure out why we can't get back to --
19 showed an incredible difference between how many of you open
20 up and read the official mailings versus the mailings from
21 the citizen groups like our citizens' guides.

22 How many of you remember and are here tonight because
23 you received the official agency mailing? Two.

24 How many of you are here because you received a notice
25 from a citizens group?

1 So you are double counting. Which one was more
2 important?

3 ROXY GIDDINGS: Well, I got yours later than
4 theirs, and so -- But I'm a downwinder, so I have real
5 reason to read what they send me.

6 GERRY POLLET: So one person who responds to both
7 and one person who came solely from the official mailing and
8 everyone else from citizens groups.

9 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: There was an ad in the
10 Seattle Weekly too. That's where I found it.

11 GERRY POLLET: How many of you saw the Weekly ad
12 and came because of the Weekly ad?

13 Two people? That great. Two people makes it worth it.
14 Thanks for coming just from the ad.

15 Based on the decision that Dieter mentioned about
16 Ecology not paying for public participation grants, you will
17 not be receiving these anymore. So there won't be many
18 people coming to public meetings if those funds aren't
19 restored. The legislature directed the Department of Energy
20 to -- Ecology to charge the energy department for it, but
21 the energy department has refused to pay for them.

22 So we're putting out the question, where is the
23 commitment? You say you are for public involvement. Where
24 is the commitment? It's easy to say "We're going to miss
25 you" and drop-kick you out the door, because literally this

1 is Ecology's decision to cut the program. It's not like,
2 "Gee, we're going to miss you. We're sorry," as Dieter
3 said. In fact it's Ecology proposing to cut the program in
4 its budget cut proposals to the governor and it's the energy
5 department saying to Ecology, "We will not step up and pay
6 for it as we have in the past." And without it, you know,
7 our programs to review documents and do the research and
8 comment will go on. Our programs supported by you, the
9 public, to litigate when we have to litigate will go on.
10 But getting the word out to 20,000 people around the region,
11 who are not going to read the official notice, is not going
12 to happen the way it has. And that's the really sad
13 reality.

14 The energy -- I mean the TPA listserv for the most
15 contaminated site in the western hemisphere, the biggest
16 Superfund site in the country, the most expensive public
17 works program in the United States is a measly 750 people,
18 half of whom are actually contractors or agency officials.
19 So 375 people maximum on the listserv for the largest
20 cleanup and most contaminated area and the largest threat to
21 human health and the environment in the Pacific Northwest.
22 That's dismal.

23 We have sites here in Seattle with larger listservs.
24 And we need a commitment not only to increase the size of it
25 but to put the dollars into the plan to make it reality.

1 And we urge you to call for that in your comments tonight.

2 Thanks.

3 JUDY SMITH: Thank you, Gerry.

4 And a question that I have on that is, will you be
5 submitting your presentation or will you be also making
6 remarks during the spoken comment part of the evening?

7 GERRY POLLET: We will make remarks, but you could
8 take the presentation and put it in the official comments
9 just like that.

10 JUDY SMITH: Okay.

11 Will that meet your needs, project team?

12 EMERALD LAIJA: (Nods head affirmatively.)

13 JUDY SMITH: Okay. Great. All righty.

14 Well, now, the next -- I'm trying to see. Probably our
15 next ten or 15 minutes what's an opportunity is for
16 questions to clarify anything you heard during the
17 presentations. And this will be back-and-forth
18 conversation. And so we'll be clarifying. And this is not
19 part of the official public comment because a lot of times
20 we are clarifying misunderstandings and it's more of a
21 conversation. And so if I do hear you making a
22 recommendation or offering a change, I will ask you to make
23 that statement or write that statement for the public
24 comment record.

25 And if anybody likes also something -- I haven't asked

1 the team about this. But if you would like to make some
2 spoken comments and you suffer from stage fright, I'm sure
3 that you could come up and sit down next to the court
4 reporter after the meeting and offer your comments maybe to
5 her and one of the project team members and we could get
6 your comments that way also, because we don't want to lose
7 any good input just because we don't have the mechanism
8 available. And so I think that, you know -- I think we're
9 hearing a theme in this meeting of improving our process
10 continually as we can.

11 So I'll open the questions to anyone.

12 (Court reporter interruption.)

13 JUDY SMITH: Do you need people identified during
14 this part of the meeting transcript?

15 EMERALD LAIJA: No.

16 JIM KELLEY: Hi. My name is Jim Kelley. I'm from
17 Seattle.

18 My question is, I think you mentioned, Judy, that --
19 This is actually for you. I think you mentioned that you
20 worked on the Portland Harbor Superfund site plan. And
21 actually that's one that we have looked at and seen as being
22 a well-written, well-developed plan that is very specific
23 and holds agencies accountable. I'm curious whether you are
24 working on actually writing this plan and if you might be --
25 might recommend, as someone who has written a very good

1 plan, might recommend that level of specificity and
2 accountability for this specific plan.

3 JUDY SMITH: Thank you. I didn't expect a
4 question. I get to take my facilitator hat off here for a
5 minute.

6 And actually, I am surprised, because that plan was
7 written in 2002 and the Community Involvement Handbook
8 specifies that they will be updated every five years. So
9 it's actually being updated right now. But it's -- I
10 consider it kind of horribly out-of-date. And I'm actually
11 detailed off of Portland Harbor for the next some nine
12 months to a year. I'm working on a project in Alaska.

13 So but I do think that we -- you know, as far as our
14 community involvement network regionally and nationally,
15 we -- you know, we do trade information. There's actually a
16 national community involvement conference. I don't know --
17 Sometimes community groups will go to that, especially it
18 was in Seattle a couple years ago. But there's actually a
19 Community Involvement Plan of the Year Award, where we're
20 encouraged to look at really good examples of community
21 involvement plans and incorporate those things when we
22 update it.

23 So I will turn it back over to Emy.

24 EMERALD LAIJA: One thing I'll clarify. In that
25 case when EPA is doing the cleanup it's a bit different.

1 The Public Involvement Plan is not an EPA document. It is a
2 Tri-Party Agreement document. So all of the agencies have
3 to agree upon its contents. It's not some EPA getting into
4 details that they can stamp off of because they're holding
5 themselves responsible to that. In this case it's not just
6 one agency but the three of us that have to agree on it. So
7 that makes the dynamic different than what is experienced at
8 EPA-lead Superfund sites in other areas across the nation.

9 JIM KELLEY: May I follow up on that? I mean, that
10 being the case, you are talking about the other two agencies
11 being regulatory agencies. I would think that, if anything,
12 the other two agencies that are parties to the Tri-Party
13 Agreement are regulatory agencies. So I would think if
14 anything, that would call for a more specific and
15 results-driven and regulatory-themed plan than one that was
16 led only by the Department of Energy.

17 EMERALD LAIJA: Let me clarify. I work for EPA, so
18 I'm talking about EPA leads, where EPA is both doing the
19 cleanup and serving as its own -- I wouldn't say its own
20 regulator, but is in full control of the decisions. It's
21 slightly different from a federal facility, which is what
22 Hanford is, and the dynamics are different.

23 Every time I go to an EPA training they say, "This is
24 how we clean up Superfund sites." And we can go through
25 this. Then there's a little asterisk, saying, "Well, if you

1 work at a federal facility, this is how it's different,"
2 because you do have to deal with the dynamics with the
3 agreement between the other parties of that decision, in
4 this case the Tri-Party Agreement.

5 I don't know if that helps, but that's the reasoning
6 behind it.

7 GERRY POLLET: While we're on this, I mean, the
8 Superfund law applies equally whether DOE or EPA is in the
9 lead, right?

10 EMERALD LAIJA: (Nods head affirmatively.)

11 GERRY POLLET: So when the Superfund law says a
12 community involvement plan will describe the following,
13 including the public rights for each step, are you saying
14 that you negotiate that away with the energy department?

15 EMERALD LAIJA: No, Gerry. What I'm saying is that
16 the regulation, the requirement is that we have a public
17 involvement plan, or legally referred to as a community
18 relations plan. That is a requirement. We have guidance
19 that says, "Your community involvement plan or public
20 involvement plan should look like this." However, that is
21 not a legal requirement. We cannot legally say, "This is
22 what it has to look like." The legal requirement is only
23 for the existence of the document but not necessarily for
24 its contents. So that's the -- When you say that the guide
25 is a legal requirement, that's actually inaccurate. It's

1 not a requirement by law.

2 GERRY POLLET: So if 40 CFR 300.45(c)(1) says you
3 are supposed to -- the lead agency, which would be DOE or
4 EPA, is supposed to revise the plan to reflect community
5 concerns that pertains to the remedial design construction
6 phase, for example -- I'm just reading from the Portland
7 Superfund Harbor's plan, which cites each step and the rules
8 that apply to it for the plan -- why wouldn't that apply to
9 the Department of Energy as the lead here, since it's -- I
10 mean, it's a federal law. It has the same -- The rule has
11 the same effect as the law. And you are both supposed to
12 follow it.

13 EMERALD LAIJA: So I heard you cite a requirement
14 to take public input in the remedial design phase of a
15 cleanup process. Is that the citation you are referring to?

16 GERRY POLLET: To revise the community involvement
17 plan, not just take comment, but to revise the plan prior to
18 the remedial design phase.

19 EMERALD LAIJA: The only issue with that and why
20 federal facilities are somewhat different is that we could
21 be in the remedial design phase of the Hanford site for many
22 different projects at any given time. It's so large of a
23 site we divide it up into smaller units. And those go
24 through the same process at --

25 GERRY POLLET: But you can't say that's not true for

1 the Portland Superfund site as well, which is in five
2 different phases at any given time because it's a huge site.

3 This is just an example of there are rules that apply.
4 And I think what Mr. Kelley is asking and we're concerned
5 about is you seem to act as if those rules don't apply just
6 because you have an agreement with the energy department.

7 EMERALD LAIJA: I don't mean to give that
8 perception. That is not the case. The things we are
9 legally required to hold ourselves to we do hold ourselves
10 to and we will hold ourselves to. If you think that
11 regulation is something that's not being held, I encourage
12 you to provide that citation and allow us to answer that in
13 print in our comments and response document so it can be
14 clear where we stand on that.

15 MARTUS LEE: Good evening. Martus Lee here in
16 Seattle.

17 Two questions. First, just to clarify, on one document
18 to another you provided, one was talking about the third
19 bullet point on streamlining information. And I know that
20 you mentioned of course part of it was removing outdated
21 information, that of course being important. The other one,
22 which I'm not sure -- And again, refresh my memory if you
23 did mention this. Technically removing some information
24 that is electronically available, will in the document there
25 be a summary to describe that process to alert the reader of

1 what happened and why some information isn't there and then
2 to provide information of how and why certain things aren't
3 in there?

4 And then my second question, if you just want to answer
5 it easier: The next schedule for the next participation
6 plan, 1990, 2002, 2011 -- I'm just wondering when the next
7 series will be in Iteration 4.

8 EMERALD LAI JA: So for your first question as to
9 what was taken out, that was mostly dealing with the acronym
10 list. The 2002 version had a very large acronym list. A
11 number of those acronyms we don't really use anymore. So
12 our acronym list only deals with acronyms that are actually
13 used in the plan. There is a glossary and acronym list on
14 the website, and that is the information we didn't include
15 in the updated version.

16 I mentioned that this is actually the fifth revision to
17 the document, not the third. So we have done this five
18 times. And basically we identify a need to update the plan
19 when it becomes outdated. The recommendation is that we
20 look at that every three to five years. That's an EPA
21 guidance. However, really it comes down to the agency
22 saying, "We need to update the plan." So we don't have a
23 projected date as to when we will be having this discussion
24 again as of right now.

25 MARK LOPER: So I'm just wondering. I'm just

1 wondering, over the past nine years, what have you put in
2 the plan to improve public involvement? Like what changes
3 have you made in the turnout or in providing better notices
4 in the plan? Because I've looked at both, and I'm trying to
5 see the difference.

6 EMERALD LAI JA: We're continually trying to improve
7 our public involvement process. Recently we have put a lot
8 of effort into using different types of media to spread the
9 word. We made a video on this document that was on YouTube
10 so people could get a brief introduction to the changes that
11 we need.

12 Did anyone here see that video? A couple of people.

13 So we're trying to step out our Facebook and Twitter
14 accounts. We don't specifically say in the document "We
15 started using Facebook and Twitter in 2010" or anything like
16 that. But those are efforts that are ongoing.

17 The difficulty with putting them in print is that a
18 couple of months from now that might be outdated, because we
19 are trying to keep up with the technology to some extent and
20 just improving our print ads and also our listserv notices
21 even, just trying to make them more interesting to people
22 who read them.

23 So no, you won't see that level of detail in the
24 document. It is an overall guidance document on public
25 participation not a specific step-by-step how-to.

1 LIZ MATTSO N: Hello. One thing -- This is not
2 really a question. But I wanted to let people know that I
3 come to a lot of public meetings and I have a lot of
4 opportunity to comment. Just so that people know, when you
5 comment you can comment multiple times. I was on the
6 webinar and I gave a comment. Tonight I'm going to give a
7 comment. I'm also going to type up my detailed comments
8 that say things like "On page 5 I think that this should
9 happen to this paragraph," which I might not do in my verbal
10 comment tonight because that would be really boring for
11 people to hear.

12 And I also put together a "Say What?" guide that Hanford
13 Challenges put together that lists all of the documents
14 that -- It lists the documents and any available resources
15 for the document, when public meetings are. And that's on
16 our website, and there's copies of it on the back table.

17 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: Which one is that?

18 LIZ MATTSO N: Hanfordchallenge.org.

19 So if you have questions tonight, the plan is only 30 or
20 so pages long and I encourage you to actually just read it
21 if you have comments. It's not that long.

22 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: Hi. I was just wondering a
23 couple of things. One is what -- if you have considered
24 this, what is specifically considered I guess about cultural
25 sensitivity in terms of bringing out more of a diverse

1 public involvement as well as just more public involvement
2 and how you sort of considered cultural issues in bringing
3 this out.

4 And then the other was kind of the same idea but with
5 student involvement. I know that Seattle U was mentioned,
6 but I wasn't sure if there was any other schools that were
7 specifically thought about.

8 EMERALD LAI JA: So as far as outreach to
9 universities or schools, Dieter mentioned that Ecology has
10 gone out to several classrooms at the university level to
11 just spread awareness about Hanford and to encourage
12 participation in whatever Hanford decisions are going on at
13 that time.

14 As far as cultural groups, are you referring to minority
15 populations or tribal groups or just in general?

16 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: In general. And I'm just
17 thinking about how each location for each meeting will sort
18 of bring about a different cultural representation.

19 EMERALD LAI JA: So we haven't issued things in
20 other language or tried to craft our notifications to a
21 certain cultural level or pointed at a specific cultural
22 sensitivity to any extent. So we haven't -- I would say we
23 haven't done a very targeted multicultural process. I
24 think -- I hope I'm addressing your question --

25 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: Yeah.

1 EMERALD LAI JA: -- by answering that.

2 And I'm sorry if there was another question I've lost.

3 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: Well, the other was just
4 sort of about the students.

5 EMERALD LAI JA: The students. Okay. Yeah, so
6 again, reaching out to the universities. We also have the
7 Hanford Speakers Bureau that's run by DOE, and they go out
8 to not only universities but different groups in the Pacific
9 Northwest. They're actually reaching out through Skype to
10 areas even further out that they can't necessarily get to to
11 give presentations on Hanford and just spread awareness
12 about the Hanford site. And that has gained a lot of
13 momentum.

14 Did you want to elaborate, Paula?

15 PAULA CALL: Yeah, sure. Thanks.

16 So it's a really tough question that you asked. And,
17 you know, there's a lot of issues that people, humans, can
18 pay attention to these days. There's certainly plenty of
19 issues to get involved with. And so Hanford is one. For
20 some people it's a primary issue.

21 For many, I think, you know, if you look at the history
22 of public involvement over the years -- and there's a really
23 good paper that's been put out recently on this at
24 Hanford -- back in the days when the site was being used for
25 plutonium production, there were large groups of concerned

1 ci ti zens. There were many more ci ti zens groups. There were
2 many more activi sts. Once the mi ssion of the si te changed
3 about 1988, '89 to no longer production, no longer plutoni um
4 production, now we're in a cleanup mode, it took a few years
5 for those groups to kind of watch and see, "Are they
6 serious? Are they really changing the mission? Is it
7 really true?" I think once they saw that those changes were
8 actually taking place, those groups stopped showi ng up. We
9 stopped hearing from them. They kind of probably went on to
10 other more urgent i ssues.

11 So I think that now the mode we're in is, you know, we
12 continually hear from folks "You need to get more peopl e
13 involved. You are doing something wrong because more peopl e
14 aren' t i nvolved. "

15 I don't know if that's true or not, honestly. You know,
16 we do -- we do a lot more than -- well, we do more than any
17 agency's effort that I've seen in doing outreach and putting
18 the word out and spending dollars trying to get peopl e
19 involved. There's only so much -- You know, there's so much
20 you can do in that area. Those resources that we spend in
21 that area are not being spent on cleanup. So it's kind of a
22 balanci ng act.

23 That said, we do recognize that we don't have a lot of
24 diversi ty in the public involvement that we do. So we are
25 actually -- through our Speakers Bureau we are targeting

1 minority groups. In fact, this year we have a goal to reach
2 out to many more minority groups than we have and see if we
3 can -- if they will at least let us come in the door and
4 talk to them about it, make that the starting point.

5 The other thing I wanted to mention was our tours
6 program. In the last few years we have started making room
7 for more university tours. In the past we have focused
8 solely on public, so now we're really doing more targeted
9 outreach towards universities. And so I think it's a good
10 step. And I think you are right, we need to do more. We
11 want to involve youth more as well as minority groups.

12 MANITA HOLTROP: Hi. My name is Manita Hol trop,
13 and I think you brought up a really good issue, that more
14 urgent issues have popped up since 1970, climate changes and
15 things like that, that are taking people's attention away
16 maybe from nuclear power. But that doesn't make this issue
17 less important.

18 The other thing I want to say: I don't know if anyone
19 has mentioned the e-mail list of 750 people, half of which
20 are people that work at Hanford anyway. So we have got like
21 a major toxic polluting site and 350 people are maybe
22 getting e-mails about it.

23 But the other thing is where you set -- I'm not sure who
24 set the meeting. Did you guys set the meeting?

25 EMERALD LAI JA: (Nods head affirmatively.)

1 MANITA HOLTROP: The meeting is set in a dark
2 labyrinth which is completely deserted, almost impossible to
3 find if you don't know your way around Seattle very well.
4 And then I have to compromise my personal safety just to get
5 to the meeting, which is ironic, because then I'm coming to
6 comment about my personal and public safety. So this is a
7 shocking location for me. And no wonder a lot of people
8 didn't come. I feel very strongly about this issue, and I
9 was dissuaded from coming.

10 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: Who agrees with her?

11 (Some people raise hands.)

12 PAULA CALL: Thank you. You know, we love this
13 kind of feedback.

14 Actually, we have heard from many stakeholders that this
15 is a good location. So it's really great to have you, you
16 know, a new face, show up and say this is not a good
17 location and here is why. So we really appreciate that.

18 We would like to have folks like you on the listserv.
19 We would like to have folks like you on our short list of
20 stakeholders that we talk to before we plan public meetings,
21 because, frankly, we're trying to extend those lists. And,
22 you know, we have maybe 25, 30 folks that participate in
23 those calls. So please sign up and give us more feedback.
24 We like it.

25 JUDITH HOMAY: Hi. I'm Judith Homay, and I'm from

1 Seattle. And I just wanted to clarify something about you
2 guys who are involved in the decision-making process for
3 these public decision grants that were, you know, taken
4 away. Before you did that, did you take -- did you do any
5 cuts to your own program? Did you do anything else? Or was
6 it kind of directed just to the citizen groups?

7 DIETER BOHRMANN: Well, back in I think it was
8 August, when it looked like the budget forecast was going to
9 be pretty dismal, the governor authorized -- or required all
10 the agencies to propose cuts of up to 10 percent in their
11 budgets. And that was done statewide. And at that point,
12 there were no proposed cuts to the public participation
13 grants. And then when those cuts were proposed, the
14 governor looked at these numbers and said, "That's not going
15 to do it. That's not enough money. Go back and cut 5 more
16 percent."

17 So now the agencies are cutting 15 percent of their
18 budgets. It's a huge, huge percentage of the agencies' --
19 And this is not just Ecology; this is across the state. At
20 that point, we were having to make decisions that, you know,
21 nobody wanted to make. And one of the production -- One of
22 the proposed cuts -- And it did not come from the office
23 that I work at. It's our Waste 2 Resources program that
24 administers these grants. And they offered up that
25 reduction as part of the 15 percent.

1 So does that mean all these proposed cuts are going to
2 be accepted? We don't know. We don't know what decisions
3 were made -- are going to be made. It could be that, like I
4 said, none of the cuts to the grants will be accepted. It
5 could be that some of them will or all of them will. So --

6 And, you know, just to I guess put a little perspective
7 to this, there are massive cuts being proposed to education,
8 higher education, the basic health plan for low-income
9 residents. The Department of Corrections is proposing
10 letting prisoners go early as part of their cuts. So this
11 is -- I mean, this is one of a number of very, very
12 difficult decisions.

13 JUDITH HOMAY: Of that 15 percent, how much of that
14 actually is the public participation cut, to your knowledge?

15 DIETER BOHRMANN: I don't know. I know that there
16 was 2 and a half million dollars for the public
17 participation grants for this biennium, 2011 through 2013.
18 And the proposal on the table is to cut \$2.1 million of
19 that.

20 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: That only leaves .4.

21 DIETER BOHRMANN: Yeah. There would be about
22 \$360,000 that would be funded.

23 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: For groups across, not just
24 Hanford.

25 DIETER BOHRMANN: Correct, yes, statewide.

1 JUDY SMITH: And just as a check-in, I am letting
2 the Q and A run along a little bit just because right now I
3 have six speaker cards. So, you know, we don't have to rush
4 into the formal public comment section, but I know that that
5 is one of the main purposes that we're here.

6 So does everybody want to kind of continue this for a
7 little bit? Do we have a few more questions?

8 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: I have a question just for a
9 matter of clarification.

10 Emerald, when you were giving your presentation, when
11 you said a comment and response document will be issued,
12 what does that mean?

13 EMERALD LAIJA: So a comment and response
14 document -- I kind of explained what that was. We compile
15 the comments, and then we identify which ones we will be
16 able to incorporate into the final document and which ones
17 we won't be able to do so, and then we'll explain why.

18 So that's an example of the comment and response
19 document from the 2002 revisions to the Public Involvement
20 Plan. And that's why we really would like people to join
21 our listserv, because that's one way we're letting people
22 know, "Hey, this document is out. If you want to see how
23 your comments were used, please read this." And that's
24 available at hanford.gov, the administrative record, which I
25 know is a very large document. It's much easier if we can

1 just provide you that link so you can just click on it and
2 see how your comments were used.

3 Did I answer your question?

4 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: So you just mean it's
5 available online, and then it's --

6 EMERALD LAIJA: All the Tri-Party Agreement
7 agencies work together to create that document, and we agree
8 with all the content of that document. Then we finalize it,
9 we print a few copies and send that to our administrative
10 record, and then we make it publicly available online, yes.

11 JUDY SMITH: Okay. Any other questions? Otherwise
12 we'll --

13 LIZ MATTSO: It's not a lot. I'm just curious.
14 How many people have read the plan?

15 One, two, three. Okay. Just curious.

16 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: Actually, this looks great,
17 because I thought I was the only one that didn't read the
18 plan, because I read the information about it last night.
19 Is someone going to provide a synopsis of what the plan is?
20 In other words, is this what you went through here?

21 EMERALD LAIJA: You know, we actually have -- we
22 have a facts sheet that was sent out through our mailing
23 list. So if you want to join that you can get that in print
24 sent to your home. And that's available on the back table.
25 And also have a frequently asked questions sheet.

1 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: I understand that, but I'm
2 just saying, as I listen to these comments, I want to add
3 context to what the comments are. And if nine out of ten
4 people have not read the plan, maybe a five-minute overview
5 of the plan might be beneficial.

6 EMERALD LAIJA: Well, I had hoped to do that by
7 discussing what the major changes were.

8 Do you want -- I mean, do people want more information
9 on the specific changes?

10 PAULA CALL: Do you want to put the chapters back
11 up, to go over it again? You kind of did -- You gave an
12 overview of the plan.

13 JUDY SMITH: I do have a few copies of the plan. I
14 didn't bring a bunch. But I have like eight copies. So
15 first come, first serve if people would like a copy.

16 LIZ MATTSOON: And if anybody wants my copy, they
17 can have it. I have one.

18 EMERALD LAIJA: So a couple of people are getting
19 copies of the document. Do people want me to spend more
20 time going over its content, or are we okay on that front?

21 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: Is this a summary?

22 EMERALD LAIJA: Yes.

23 JUDY SMITH: And I think with that -- Emy, I know
24 you have said this -- the public comment period is actually
25 still going to be going until mid-December now.

1 EMERALD LAI JA: Yes.

2 JUDY SMITH: And so if you are not prepared to make
3 comments tonight, you know, you still have a month to send
4 them by e-mail or mailing in.

5 EMERALD LAI JA: And if you want to have -- I mean,
6 anyone here can feel free to call me. I can provide you my
7 contact information if you want to discuss the plan. Maybe
8 we can't take time to do it at this meeting here, but if you
9 just want more information and more context, I'd be glad to
10 talk to anybody about it over the phone or by e-mail.

11 LIZ MATTSOON: So we're trying to make it easier for
12 people to comment, since documents -- most Hanford public
13 involvement is commenting on documents, which are sometimes
14 thousands and thousands of pages long. This one just
15 happens to be actually readable.

16 So we have developed this "Say What?" guide that tells
17 you what you're commenting on, how to submit your comment,
18 if there's a deadline, and then links to every available
19 document about whatever you're commenting on. So this is on
20 our website. I've got copies of this back here. And we're
21 usually linked to any comments or advice that's been written
22 about the comment period or during that comment period so
23 you have a reference.

24 And there's some copies of what the Hanford Advisory
25 Board's looks like back here if you want a sense of more

1 formal versions of comments, just to give you a sense of
2 what it could look like, because it is confusing when you
3 are commenting on something if it's a document focus.

4 But that's not to say it's not helpful to also share
5 your thoughts about public involvement in general. That is
6 still useful too.

7 JUDY SMITH: Yeah, I agree. And I think that, you
8 know, this is kind of the -- you know, kind of the starter
9 in the process and the comments on how and why to comment.
10 And I know that a lot of times especially documents and --
11 When we get a comment that just says "I hate this document,"
12 it really doesn't give the agencies a lot to improve. And
13 so I know that the team is really interested in why or
14 things that you would like more of or that are helpful to
15 you. And anything you say, they will be giving you a
16 written response to that comment in the comment document.
17 And so it really is an opportunity to air things.

18 And if it is something that is completely outside -- you
19 know, if it doesn't pertain to Hanford -- I've had that
20 happen, that it doesn't even pertain to the site -- or it's
21 not something that can be changed or effected, the response
22 might be, you know, "Your concern is important, but that's
23 not something that we can effect in this particular
24 document."

25 But I'm stepping out of my facilitator role going into

1 public involvement.

2 So with that, why don't we go ahead and transition into
3 the public comment portion of the evening. And I have a
4 short stack of cards here. And as I say, this will just be
5 the start of the opportunity.

6 And we have a microphone there if people want to stand
7 up and go to it. And if you would prefer to just have one
8 of us bring you a microphone there at your seat, we would be
9 happy to do that too.

10 And Gerry, you were the first one to submit a card, if
11 you would like to go first.

12 And I guess the other thing I'd like to ask: If there's
13 anybody that needs to leave that has parking expiring or
14 anything else, if you could let us know -- or day care
15 expiring and we can have you go.

16 MARK LOPER: I think he is on the phone right now.

17 JUDY SMITH: Well, we'll just postpone his
18 opportunity.

19 Mark?

20 MARK LOPER: So I'd just like to reiterate all the
21 recommendations and advice that we gave in the presentation
22 earlier, and then just stressing that with no commitments in
23 the document, it's hard to think that the document is being
24 treated seriously. And all of our advice points are asking
25 for commitments for ensuring or guaranteeing. And without

1 those different pieces, it's -- the document is practically
2 meaningless. So I think like having base minimum
3 commitments listed in there, at least the legal commitments
4 that are listed in there, clearly and well defined is
5 extremely important to having this plan be successful.

6 Thank you.

7 JUDY SMITH: Thank you, Mark.

8 Our next speaker is Jacinta.

9 Did I get it right?

10 JACINTA HEATH: Yes, ma'am.

11 Hello. My name is Jacinta Heath. I'm a student at the
12 University of Washington. I'm actually doing my honors
13 thesis on you guys' s Public Involvement Plan, in looking at
14 the changes that have been made, and just kind of taking
15 note of who is present at these meetings and, you know, what
16 sort of people are being represented within the
17 decision-making process.

18 I like to see that you guys are doing different media
19 outreach strategies. That's nice to see. I think if you
20 increased -- if you spent more time developing relationships
21 with certain members of the community or, you know, certain
22 professors at the university, that would be helpful in
23 increasing involvement. If there was some sort of incentive
24 for young people to get involved with the decision-making
25 process, that would be helpful, as well as getting more

1 stakeholder perspectives involved in this.

2 Also, if the documents were more accessible to the
3 general public, we would be seeing, you know, different sort
4 of people involved. I'm concerned that there's a lot -- You
5 know, there's academic involvement. There's people who have
6 been recruited from, you know, the community involving
7 groups that you guys have been supporting in the past. But
8 we're not seeing a lot of, you know, the common citizen
9 getting involved in the decision-making process. And I
10 think that's concerning, especially those who are
11 disproportionately impacted by the activities that are going
12 on at Hanford. We're not seeing a lot of those groups
13 represented at these meetings. So, you know, if you guys
14 could have a working group on increasing outreach to those
15 populations, that would -- I'd like to see that.

16 Also, I think it's a bad idea to cut funding to the
17 community involvement organizations, because it's been shown
18 in the past and currently that they're recruiting more
19 people to become part of this process.

20 So yeah, I think that's pretty much it. I'll write --
21 I'm going to do an extensive write-up and submit it in
22 writing, so it will be a lot more comprehensive, hopefully
23 more helpful for you guys. So thank you for coming.

24 JUDY SMITH: Thank you for your comment.

25 The next commenter is Liz Mattson.

1 LIZ MATTSOON: Thank you.

2 My name is Liz Mattson, and I work for Hanford
3 Challenge, a nonprofit organization that focuses on Hanford
4 cleanup. I'm also the vice chair of the Public Involvement
5 and Communication Committee of the Hanford Advisory Board.

6 My comment is on the framing of a supportive public in
7 the Hanford Public Involvement Plan. On page 8, the
8 document references that public support for cleanup plays a
9 vital role in decision-making. To me, public input plays a
10 vital role, not support. Sometimes lack of support is what
11 improves cleanup decisions the most. The public's lack of
12 support should have as much of an impact on decisions as the
13 support for those decisions.

14 There was a recent comment period on 21 waste sites on
15 Hanford's Central Plateau, called PW-1,3,6 and CW-5, in
16 which a majority of the comments urged the Department of
17 Energy to dig up more plutonium than they were planning to
18 remove. The final decision was made for remediating these
19 waste sites and was issued in a document called a record of
20 decision in late September. A few impacts were made to the
21 language of plutonium removal in the response to public
22 comments, saying that although the Department of Energy and
23 EPA do not consider plutonium that will be left in place to
24 pose an unacceptable risk, they will, based on public
25 comment, assess plutonium 239 and 240 levels after

1 excavating to the specified depths in the High-Salt Waste
2 Group, which is where there was a lot of plutonium. DOE
3 agreed to consider additional removal of
4 plutonium-contaminated soil from these waste sites.

5 Though this sentiment holds the potential for a course
6 correction mid-cleanup, considering removing plutonium is
7 not a commitment to remove more plutonium. The public was
8 very clear about asking for more plutonium removal. And as
9 a member of the public, I have a hard time feeling confident
10 that this language will lead to more plutonium removal.

11 And I urge members of the public to read the record of
12 decision. It is a well-written document and worth reading,
13 especially the responsiveness summary, which captures public
14 comments and the agencies' responses that starts on page
15 110.

16 The public's lack of support had little noticeable
17 impact on the decision. This worries me. For public
18 involvement to work, for people to continue showing up and
19 weighing in on cleanup decisions, there needs to be a
20 commitment to listen to the public and incorporate public
21 input into the decision, even if that alters the course of
22 cleanup. This would demonstrate that until the public
23 involvement process is over, the decision has not been made.

24 In closing, I want to urge a shift in thinking through
25 the language in the plan that acknowledges the benefit of

1 public input on decision-making be it supportive or
2 unsupportive. I would also like to see language in the plan
3 that reflects an effort to incorporate public values and
4 input into decisions and a communication process that allows
5 the public to see the impact they have had.

6 I appreciate the agencies for providing opportunities to
7 comment both in person, on webinars, on phone calls, and on
8 paper and e-mail. I appreciate efforts to try new things,
9 improving advertising for events and listening to and
10 implementing suggestions for making information more
11 understandable. And I will be submitting more detailed
12 comments in writing.

13 And I just wanted to say on top of this, a lot of times
14 we talk about the agencies being responsible for all public
15 involvement. And I think we have -- we also have the
16 ability as members of the public, for me as someone who
17 works for a public interest group focused on Hanford
18 cleanup, to take public involvement into our own hands. It
19 is a setback that we have lost funding for some of our
20 public involvement efforts, but there are creative ways to
21 get public involvement efforts out there. We're trying one
22 of them with our Inheriting Hanford project that you can
23 find out about on the back table.

24 So thank you, and that's it.

25 JUDY SMITH: Thank you.

1 Our next speaker is Mani ta Hol trop.

2 MANI TA HOL TROP: I'm Mani ta Hol trop. I want to
3 back up everything you said. I think that there should be a
4 requirement in the Public Involvement Plan that there are
5 quarterly meetings with members of the public. And
6 actually, what I'd like to see is that the Tri-Parties are
7 not just held accountable to the public but actually action
8 plans come out of sitting in a meeting, hashing out a plan
9 with the public, with members of the public. So there's the
10 Tri-Parties, and then there's the public group that creates
11 the plan together. Does that make sense?

12 Okay. Thank you.

13 JUDY SMITH: Okay. That exhausts the cards, except
14 for Gerry, who is still out of the room. But would anybody
15 else like to get up and make comments?

16 Sure. Thank you. Roxy.

17 ROXY GIDDINGS: I'm Roxy Giddings. I've been
18 making comments for years, since, oh, sometime after 1954.

19 I think notifications should let me know how the process
20 will affect environmental health now and for the next
21 hundred thousand years. I can't make a comment about the
22 process unless I know how it's going to affect the health of
23 the environment for the next hundred thousand years.

24 And I call this the stirring, the Hanford stirring
25 process, where we stir things up, separate them out, put

1 them in a more expensive container, put them through a more
2 expensive process, and end up with a procedure that leaves a
3 structure that will be so radioactive that no one will be
4 able to get anywhere near it.

5 And it seems kind of like we're in that mode now. We
6 have some things that no human being should ever be anywhere
7 near. And so ten feet of soil? 50 feet of soil?

8 Anyhow, the materials presented to the public concerning
9 this Hanford stirring process Tri-Party Agreement should
10 have a logo on the front to alert us to the need for public
11 notice, so that when e-mails come out they all come out with
12 the same logo on them: Now, don't delete this one.

13 If we really want public input, maybe the Tri-Party
14 members should get together and publish documents more like
15 the ones that the citizens groups put out or more like what
16 comes out in the newspaper, which tells us almost every time
17 there will be something about the health of the environment.

18 So and I guess I did have one question. All these
19 comments that I've made -- I noticed that on the citizens
20 group survey, they didn't know whether their comments had
21 been received or any comment had been made back to them
22 about their comments. And I can't remember -- And maybe I
23 just never paid attention. But I don't remember ever having
24 anybody from Hanford ever make a comment about my comment.

25 So and of course if you are living in the 20th century

1 not the 21st, like I am, you don't have e-mail. So that's a
2 very interesting thing. Not having e-mail causes people who
3 don't have it to be eliminated from organizations' lists,
4 mailing lists. It gets to be really interesting. All of a
5 sudden I'm not in the Sierra Club, I'm not in Audubon, I'm
6 not in Greenpeace, I'm not in all of these organizations,
7 because they only want to talk to me through e-mail. So and
8 my husband says he refuses to conform to this world, so we
9 don't have e-mail.

10 JUDY SMITH: Thank you, Roxy.

11 Since I don't have a card for you, if you could just say
12 your name for the --

13 JIM KELLEY: Yeah. It's Jim Kelley again. And
14 that's K-e-l-l-e-y. Most people misspell that.

15 I wasn't planning on commenting, but I do have just a
16 couple of things quickly that I wanted to mention. I hate
17 to be nitpicky here. But in the comments that you made at
18 the beginning of the meeting, Dieter, you mentioned often
19 talking to groups. And it may sound picky, but language
20 matters. And, you know, what we would hope in a process
21 like this is that you are talking with groups. And so
22 that's just, you know, maybe a little bit of a picky
23 comment.

24 Also, I hope there are no Seattle Weekly reporters here,
25 because I'm about to compare them unfavorably to their

1 competition, The Stranger. But I would say that if you want
2 to get more involvement of people who actually come out and
3 do things on a political level in Seattle, I would suggest
4 advertising in The Stranger at least as well as the Weekly.
5 Or if you have to choose between the two, I would definitely
6 choose The Stranger.

7 And finally, I did want to mention that it's probably
8 not a project that a lot of folks here supported, but I did
9 the -- I wrote and worked on the Neighborhood Involvement
10 Plan for CenturyLink Field. And when I was working on that
11 project, we met with the neighborhoods, the three
12 neighborhoods, extensively, hours and hours of meetings to
13 develop that plan. And it was not a plan that was written
14 by us at first and goal that, you know, developed the
15 project or by the Public Stadium Authority. It was written
16 collaboratively with the affected neighborhoods. And so
17 that I thought was an excellent comment that was made
18 earlier, that that's the way to do this kind of work.

19 And it is labor-intensive, and it is fairly expensive.
20 But, you know, that was a project that cost less than
21 one-fifth of Hanford's annual cleanup budget. So I think
22 you can find the money to do this kind of stuff, really.

23 And so basically it does take hours of hashing these
24 things out with the public in order to do it right. And so
25 I just really would encourage you to, you know, rethink how

1 you do something like developing a Public Involvement Plan.

2 And then finally, what came out of that plan was an
3 actual agreement that was signed by all the parties,
4 including representatives of the International District,
5 Pioneer Square, and the Sodo neighborhood.

6 Now, you know, I would love to see a Public Involvement
7 Plan that could be signed not only by three agencies but
8 also by the key stakeholders. And so I would encourage you
9 to consider that too.

10 Thanks.

11 JUDY SMITH: Thank you, Jim.

12 And Gerry, you're our last speaker card on the table.
13 And so you are... (Pause.)

14 GERRY POLLET: My voice is rapidly going. So I
15 don't know. Can you hear me? I'll try to talk louder.

16 First off, for the record, I just would like the
17 comments -- not just the slides but the full comments that
18 Mark Loper and I projected at the beginning presentation to
19 be part of our official comments.

20 Secondly, we want to extend our thanks and appreciation
21 to the agencies for extending the comment period on this
22 plan until December 15th since Heart of America Northwest is
23 putting on public meetings in Portland and Hood River on the
24 30th and the 1st. Since the agencies declined to do public
25 meetings there, we will be doing public meetings and

1 workshops to get the same type of comments and discussion
2 that the agencies should be holding but aren't in Portland
3 and Hood River.

4 Unfortunately, that will now be one of those financial
5 struggles because the Department of Ecology and the
6 Department of Energy have been unwilling to put forward the
7 funding that they had -- the State had previously promised
8 and is unwilling to ask the energy department to step up and
9 fund as it had in past years for public participation
10 grants.

11 We believe that a Public Involvement Plan is not worth
12 the paper it's written on if it doesn't have commitments
13 that the public can rely on. If when you pick it up, you
14 can't say "Here is when I am assured of a public meeting,"
15 if you can't say "Here is when I know there's a grant
16 program that we can rely on for notices," then it isn't
17 worth having.

18 And the rules -- the National Contingency Plan is what
19 the Superfund rules are called -- specify that the Superfund
20 community involvement plans are supposed to say what the
21 agencies are committing to so that you, all of us, can rely
22 on what's in there and hold them to it. It isn't just
23 saying "We'll try and use Facebook." So what? It's not
24 saying "If there's significant interest maybe we'll agree to
25 a public meeting." It's saying -- It should be saying "When

1 you write a letter or an e-mail to this official and ask for
2 a public meeting, here is the criteria that you can rely
3 upon to be sure there will be one or if it's rejected here
4 is the criteria right there in front of you to see why it
5 was rejected," not "We didn't want to have our managers go
6 out that week" or "We couldn't afford it." We are tired of
7 hearing Hanford can't afford to do public involvement.

8 The energy department spent at least \$300,000 on a pair
9 of videos in the past 12 months. How many of you have seen
10 their videos? Slick, have an announcer, pay for a narrator,
11 pretty damn one-sided. The first ten minutes or something
12 are man-on-the-street interviews, "What do you think about
13 Hanford?" as if that is going to help us understand that
14 high-level nuclear waste tanks are leaking and spreading
15 contamination towards the Columbia River. That \$300,000
16 would pay for hundreds of citizens to show up at meetings
17 over the next two years. It's something for the agencies to
18 think about.

19 The third major point here is access to records that are
20 not guaranteed in this plan. We have one of our former law
21 students here who worked on this.

22 The Department of Energy asked the State of Washington
23 to keep from you and all of us and the rest of the public
24 such things as the locations of where the unlined burial
25 grounds that are 40 miles long are at Hanford in their

1 Hanford Hazardous Waste Department, stamping these
2 documents, their permit application documents, "Official Use
3 Only," as if it was a secret. But it's not a secret. It's
4 actually required by the federal and state hazardous waste
5 laws that they show those things and provide it to the
6 public to review. But the energy department asked that
7 these be kept secret and not disclosed to the public under
8 Washington State's public records law.

9 Heart of America Northwest went to court because we
10 couldn't review the public -- the Hanford hazardous waste
11 permit for these 40 miles of leaking, unlined soil ditches
12 unless we could see the stuff that was blacked out, pages,
13 pages blacked out.

14 It turns out they didn't have a legal basis for having
15 it stamped "Official Use Only" and blacking it out. And the
16 Department of Ecology settled with us and adopted a policy
17 that said when the public asks for the records, if the
18 energy department objects, there will be a day-for-day
19 extension of the comment period if you're entitled to those
20 records and they relate to the decision.

21 You can't comment on a permit if you can't see the
22 underlying documents. We can't do our job and analyze it
23 and tell you what's in it and suggest comments for you if we
24 can't see what's in the documents. This is fundamental for
25 open government and a public involvement plan.

1 The Department of Ecology committed to ask the other two
2 agencies to amend this plan to have that same principle in
3 it, saying that if you don't have access to records, the
4 comment period will be extended until you do day-for-day and
5 that documents that are not -- that are disclosable under
6 the federal Freedom of Information Act will not be withheld
7 under the state law from you being able to see them.

8 What happened? The Department of Energy didn't like
9 this deal. They negotiated with the State of Washington,
10 violated our settlement agreement, changed it so that they
11 get more time to keep documents from you. So now they can
12 keep documents from you for a full month. And the comment
13 period on these plans and proposals you will see in the plan
14 is how long? Usually a month, yes. The written comment
15 period, 30 days. You can get an extension on the CERCLA
16 ones for an additional 30 days. But if the energy
17 department is allowed to withhold documents for 30 days and
18 there's no legal guarantee in the plan that there will be a
19 30-day extension day for day, we're screwed and you are
20 screwed and we can't see the records that we need.

21 And this plan should guarantee a day-for-day extension
22 and should specify that the energy department will not be
23 stamping documents "Official Use Only" unless they are
24 exempt under the Freedom of Information Act and they can
25 specify what the exemption is. Those exemptions are very,

1 very narrow.

2 This isn't just a Hanford problem with the energy
3 department, by the way. The Inspector General has issued
4 reports. The General Accounting Office has issued reports.
5 Congress has had hearings and issued reports on the energy
6 department's abuse of this. As if these documents are
7 secret, they stamp them "Official Use Only." The documents
8 are not in the actual classifications for secret. It's been
9 abused across the country.

10 And we're seeing it here at Hanford, where things like a
11 permit application are stamped so that we can't review it
12 even though the federal and state hazardous waste laws say
13 you have to have access to it in order to review it. So we
14 have to change it.

15 Thank you.

16 JUDY SMITH: Yes. Do we have another comment?

17 Mani ta; is that right?

18 MANITA HOLTROP: Yeah. My name is Mani ta Hol trop.
19 I'm rather new to this issue. I've only been in Seattle six
20 years. I'm not a brain surgeon, but it makes a lot of sense
21 that if we have got a month to comment on documents and we
22 can't see the documents, that there's something wrong there.
23 I think we would all agree on that.

24 I would really like to know why you were rolling your
25 eyes when he said that. I would like an answer, please.

1 EMERALD LAI JA: My frustration during that comment
2 was coming from the fact that under CERCLA we are required
3 to have all documents that pertain to a cleanup decision
4 publicly available throughout the entire public comment
5 period. We're legally required to do that. And if we don't
6 do that and we need to extend the public comment period
7 because the document for whatever reason was not publicly
8 available, then we do that, because we're required to do
9 that.

10 I can't speak to the State on the permit, as far as
11 having documents available for that.

12 But that was my frustration, because even though it's
13 not in the plan, we are legally required to do that. And we
14 do follow those regulations.

15 MANITA HOLTRON: So the documents are not blacked
16 out?

17 EMERALD LAI JA: Again, the permit side I would have
18 to ask Dieter to respond to. But most of the decisions at
19 Hanford are under Superfund or under CERCLA. And through
20 that process the documents are not blacked out and they are
21 made publicly available. And we are working to provide
22 those links directly on our Hanford event calendar so you
23 can read every technical document that pertains to the
24 decision we're proposing.

25 MANITA HOLTRON: I would like an answer from

1 Dieter.

2 JUDY SMITH: Yeah, you know, and in his comments,
3 we'll be receiving a written response as well, so --

4 MANITA HOLTROP: Okay. But I would like to hear
5 now. The record response just goes off into space. So
6 let's have an open conversation.

7 DIETER BOHRMANN: Well, I think Gerry explained the
8 agreement with Ecology for the access to records, that if
9 they aren't available at the end of the comment period, the
10 comment period will be extended. So that was the agreement,
11 and that's what Ecology has committed to.

12 MANITA HOLTROP: Okay. Good. Thank you.

13 JUDY SMITH: Does anyone else have a comment?

14 TOM CARPENTER: So my name is Tom Carpenter, and
15 I'm the director of the Hanford Challenge and have been
16 coming to also make comments here about Hanford for 23 or '4
17 years. And I used to work with the Government
18 Accountability Project. And it's -- I've made a lot of
19 comments, so I'm not going to say a lot tonight, but I did
20 want to just point out a couple of facts and observations.

21 One is that the cleanup budget for the Hanford site is
22 somewhere around \$2 billion a year. And the DOE just issued
23 a document saying that cleanup costs over the life cycle of
24 the cleanup to 2090 is about \$115 billion. That doesn't
25 include -- I mean, that kind of underestimates, actually,

1 some of the cleanup costs that we know are going to be out
2 there.

3 But the public interest groups -- there are four that
4 were in line to get grants. And for a two-year period, that
5 would have been \$440,000. So do the math. \$2 billion a
6 year, that's a quarter of 1 percent of the cleanup budget.

7 Now, one of my favorite sayings is "Money is policy."
8 So we're here at a meeting talking about public involvement
9 and the site that has \$2 billion in taxpayer money going
10 into it that will have very severe repercussions for future
11 generations if we don't clean this place up. Even if we do,
12 it's going to have severe repercussions for human beings far
13 into the future. But we can come up with a quarter of 1
14 percent to enhance the public involvement.

15 So to me, this meeting is a bit of a joke. And no
16 offense intended to I think, you know, the fine people at
17 the table up there. I have a great deal of respect for
18 especially the local officials. These are decisions being
19 made at much higher levels. And I believe these folks are
20 sincere and want to see public involvement. However,
21 decisions are being made at higher levels.

22 And, you know, even within the state, obviously at the
23 governor's level, et cetera, this just isn't as important as
24 it should be. So I'm a little distressed about that.

25 And I think that even as comments are being solicited on

1 this public participation plan, you know, really the oomph
2 is not there, the significance, the commitment is not there
3 just beyond all the other things going on that have been
4 talked about today, which I agree with: There needs to be
5 more commitments in the plan. There needs to be
6 accountability. There needs to be transparency.

7 And, you know, personally having seen -- I call it
8 Kabuki Theater -- a lot of the public comment periods, folks
9 who have gone to it -- You know, you can pretty much dip
10 into almost any of these meetings over the years, and it's
11 agency heads, you know, paint pretty much a rosy picture of
12 what's happening at the site. They sell a plan.

13 The public interest groups have representatives that
14 have been studying the issue. I'm one of them. We get up
15 and often criticize what's being said. We tell people
16 things that weren't said. The crowd gets pissed off at the
17 fact that they feel like they have been lied to or not told
18 the whole truth about what was happening. The comments come
19 roaring in. People feel like, you know, this is why the
20 trust level is low at the agencies. And then everyone goes
21 home, and kind of wash, rinse, and repeat, right? And then
22 the next year.

23 So it's a little depressing, because it does feel a lot
24 like not a whole lot changes over the years, that there
25 isn't real good feedback, real good hearing on the part of

1 the agencies or listening. And it just seems like we're
2 being sold a plan over and over again.

3 And again, it's not necessarily the fault of the folks
4 who are here. I think a lot of times these decisions are
5 just made in D.C., that they just want to do what they do.
6 It's disconnected from the public participation process.

7 I'm not sure how we fix that. I don't give the public
8 participation and comment process all that much weight.
9 Personally I think, you know, organizing and pushing through
10 what we need to see happen is the way to go. And it's
11 just -- You know, democracy is -- things aren't given to
12 you, right? You have got to go and take it. You have got
13 to, you know, have your voice heard. And everything we have
14 ever gotten at Hanford has been because we have organized
15 enough loud voices to make that happen.

16 But it would be great to see a day when people's
17 opinions are genuinely solicited, heard, listened to, and
18 incorporated. And I think we would all like to see that in
19 this room. I'm not sure how we get there in the processes
20 that are laid out. But I think that's a vision we can all
21 share and then work towards and maybe, you know, with some
22 work and intention we can make it.

23 Those are my comments for tonight. Thanks.

24 JUDY SMITH: Thank you, Tom.

25 GERRY POLLET: I'd like to supplement my comments.

1 JUDY SMITH: Go ahead. We have time left in the
2 evening.

3 GERRY POLLET: So on the back wall you now see a
4 slide of a portion of the hazardous waste permit application
5 for Hanford's unlined low-level burial grounds as disclosed
6 to the public. Try commenting on that baby.

7 If you would move to the next, the next slide?

8 Another page deleted.

9 This is the joker, this page, because they deleted a map
10 showing where the burial grounds were, which was
11 actually readily -- When we finally got this, it turned out
12 that the map was the same map that was readily available in
13 environmental impact statements or online. But of course we
14 didn't know that for many months when we were trying to
15 review the hazardous waste permit application.

16 Now, it's nice to hear EPA say, "Oh, that's not us,"
17 except that many of these burial grounds, these are -- I
18 call them burial grounds. That's their term. These are the
19 40 miles of unlined ditches into which the energy department
20 dumped radioactive waste. So picture from I-5 from Seattle
21 to Everett -- actually, to Marysville, three lanes 50 feet
22 deep filled with chemical and radioactive wastes. A pretty
23 dismal picture, eh? And then maybe you might want to
24 comment on them.

25 And the energy department is saying most of those will

1 fall under the Superfund cleanup not the hazardous waste
2 law, based on "Trust us." They can claim that we don't have
3 hazardous waste in a lot of them, but no one has ever
4 looked. And we know there's hazardous waste in many of the
5 areas they say.

6 But the permit application is a document that will be
7 used for both processes to try to -- you know, in terms of
8 the documentation. And how do you review this?

9 Now, Ecology agreed in a legally binding settlement that
10 they shouldn't have withheld the documents and -- Well, they
11 didn't say that. They said, "We're going to change our
12 policy and agree to settle the lawsuit and pay a penalty,
13 and we're going to have new policy so we have a day-for-day
14 extension" and that only ten days for documents to be
15 withheld and if the energy department wants to stop us from
16 exposing these things they will have to go to court.

17 Then unilaterally the energy department and Ecology got
18 together and revised this decision, so that now in effect
19 the documents can be withheld for 30 days. That's their new
20 policy. 20 business days works out to be about 30 days in
21 real life. And the permit or other decision comment periods
22 are only 30 days long lawfully. And so it gets withheld.

23 Also, it just happens that under our state
24 Administrative Procedures Act, guess how long you have to
25 sue the Department of Ecology over a decision that it's

1 made? 30 days. So if you can't see the documents to see if
2 their decision was sound, then they get off scot-free. And
3 they changed this unilaterally without any public comment or
4 even a discussion with us.

5 Now, you decide if that's okay and tell the agencies
6 what you think, because that's the real picture.

7 And it's not the only document. There are many others
8 that are stamped "Official Use Only."

9 And to EPA's credit, during the plutonium liquid waste
10 discharge site comment period this summer, we couldn't get
11 the basic documents. They were not available. And only
12 after the Seattle public hearing held in this room did the
13 agencies make the documents available for us to review. And
14 they extended the comment period, but it was too late to
15 benefit you if you came to this hearing, because we didn't
16 have those documents before the Seattle public hearing for
17 you to see. There is something wrong with that.

18 What the agencies ought to be committing to is, if they
19 withhold those records they have to come back out to the
20 public after we have had a chance to review them for 30
21 days.

22 Thanks.

23 JUDY SMITH: Thank you.

24 Okay. Anybody else have comments?

25 VALERIE PACINO: Hi. My name is Valerie Pacino,

1 and I am a master's of public health student at the
2 University of Washington.

3 If you genuinely want to or if we generally want to
4 improve public involvement, cutting funding and forums for
5 public involvement seems like a strange way to do that.
6 This is a subject that doesn't lend itself well, terribly
7 well, to being understood easily or quickly. And it's very
8 easy for the language -- or for the layperson to feel
9 bullied by a lot of the information that comes out from the
10 agencies. I'm fairly adept at understanding this sort of
11 thing, and I feel bludgeoned by the technical details and
12 the acronyms.

13 And while social media is probably a boon in a lot of
14 ways, it has serious limitations. Listservs and Facebook
15 and Twitter with its 169 characters doesn't allow for a lot
16 of nuance or depth. And I think that the only opportunity
17 for that sort of thing to come out is in public forums where
18 we can have dialogues and comment periods.

19 So I would recommend strongly that you increase the
20 number of public meetings and maintain the funding to the
21 citizen watchdog groups.

22 Thank you.

23 JUDY SMITH: Thank you.

24 And Valerie, could you spell your last name for the
25 court reporter so she has that.

1 VALERIE PACINO: P-a-c-i-n-o.

2 DANIEL NOONAN: My name is Daniel Noonan,
3 N-o-o-n-a-n. And one thing about the public participation
4 grants which I did benefit from -- I did have a job with
5 WPSR that is now in question -- is that we just don't take
6 that money and like work with it. We use it to get
7 volunteers and to get a lot of people involved. So that
8 money goes much further than just like the dollar amount
9 spent. And I think it's very important to keep funding
10 those.

11 JUDY SMITH: All right. Nobody jumped into the
12 pause. So hearing no other people that want to come forward
13 and make public comments for the record, if you have
14 additional thoughts, I do encourage you to submit them in
15 writing or e-mail or by other means. You can also come up
16 and offer them to the court reporter here afterwards if you
17 want to talk. And otherwise we'll go ahead and close the
18 meeting.

19 Do we have any closing remarks from the team?

20 DIETER BOHRMANN: Yeah. I just want to reiterate
21 the listserv sign-up for the Tri-Party Agreement, the
22 agencies' Hanford listserv.

23 Agree with the comments. 750 is a start. We want more
24 names on this list. We're doing a lot of things to try to
25 build that list. So if we can get a few more names tonight,

1 everyone counts. So thank you.

2 LIZ MATTSON: One thing I just want to close with
3 is -- And I appreciate what Tom said about the people
4 sitting at this table represent agencies, but they're also
5 really likable people. So I encourage people who are here
6 to talk, stay and talk with people. I mean, not just seeing
7 representatives of agencies and --

8 I have a relationship with each of these people. I call
9 them up if I have questions. And they're really friendly
10 and easy to get information from. So just have that in your
11 mind.

12 And also, we're having a movie night on Saturday. So if
13 you are interested in learning more about Hanford, you want
14 to share something, this is about the Hanford area, and
15 there's fliers back there if you want to go see that. And
16 it's free in the U District.

17 GERRY POLLET: Dieter, as of now, the hearings on
18 the Hanford hazardous waste comments are going to be
19 approximately what time for people to be looking at in the
20 spring?

21 DIETER BOHRMANN: The public comment period is due
22 to begin May 1st, and it will run 120 days. And we are
23 planning meetings in Seattle and Spokane and Vancouver and
24 Tri-Cities. So be looking out for that.

25 GERRY POLLET: And it will be very, very important

1 for people to come to. So keep your eye out for it, because
2 it will not only be about these burial grounds, but this is
3 the permit covering what happens to the high-level waste
4 tanks and the leaks under the tanks and many, many
5 facilities and leaks and contamination areas at Hanford.
6 It's the biggest hazardous waste permit ever written in the
7 United States.

8 DIETER BOHRMANN: It is 14,000 pages long. So
9 we're going to have bookshelves for people to, you know --

10 UNIDENTIFIED CITIZEN: I want three copies.

11 DIETER BOHRMANN: Okay.

12 LIZ MATTSON: If you want an assignment --

13 DIETER BOHRMANN: Yeah.

14 Seriously, we hope to do some outreach in advance of
15 those meetings, so we would like to work with students, with
16 other groups. If you have groups you would be interested in
17 having Ecology come out and talk to you about the permit and
18 get a little more information about it before we come out
19 with the formal meetings, I'd like to talk to you about that
20 too. So thanks.

21 JUDY SMITH: Okay. Thanks.

22 So we'll go ahead. And I'm sure the team will be
23 staying around for comments and discussion afterwards.

24 (Meeting concluded.)
25

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
COUNTY OF PIERCE)

I, DIANNE WILSON, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter in and for Pierce County, Washington, do hereby certify that I reported in machine shorthand the PROPOSED CHANGES ON THE HANFORD PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN PUBLIC MEETING of NOVEMBER 15, 2011; that the foregoing transcript was prepared under my personal supervision and constitutes a true record of the proceedings to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not an attorney or counsel of any parties, nor a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor financially interested in the action.

WITNESS my hand in Sumner, County of Pierce, State of Washington, this 29th day of November, 2011.

Certified Court Reporter
License No. 2198